

**Appendix**

**A**

**LIVABLE COMMUNITIES HANDBOOK**

---

**Land Use and Design Strategies for the South Bay Cities**

# Survey of South Bay Cities

**APPENDIX A**

## SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The consultant team conducted a survey of the South Bay Cities in order to better understand existing barriers and opportunities for Livable Communities strategies. In particular, the surveys attempted to compile the following types of information:

- **General Plan Documents and Zoning Ordinances** – General plan and zoning documents provide information about the character of the community and its planning objectives; the nature and relationship of current zones within each community; significant urban form types that should be the focus of land use strategies and design guidelines; areas with the greatest potential for prospective development; existing development standards; the nature of existing land use tools and the extent to which these could encourage or inhibit livable communities concepts.
- **Specific Plans and Design Guidelines** – These documents provide more detail on land use and design objectives in areas with the greatest development and redevelopment potential or where there are specific concerns about urban design.
- **Identification of Specific Areas With Likely Development or Redevelopment Potential** – This identifies area types that should be the focus of land use strategies and design guidelines.
- **Examples of Livable Communities Land Use and Design Elements** – Any examples of livable communities design elements in existing development could be used to illustrate the design guidelines with relevant local examples. The development process for these examples would also help in the identification of successful implementation mechanisms.
- **Information about Impediments to Adoption of Livable Communities Elements** – This helps in the design of successful implementation strategies.
- **Examples of Existing Developer Incentive Programs** – This would provide information about the existing land use tools that could be used in the design of specific livable communities incentive programs.

To implement the survey, the consultant team first prepared a draft survey covering the topics described above to be circulated among planning and community development directors in each of the cities. The draft was reviewed by all members of the consultant team and the Livable Communities Working Group. Ultimately the survey was prepared as a two page form with ten questions. Respondents were instructed to refer to planning documents whenever possible to provide more information than could be incorporated on the survey forms. A cover letter was prepared that introduced the Livable Communities Program and its objectives, explained the purpose of the current

## APPENDIX A

project and the SCAG funding, requested general plans and zoning ordinances, and provided instructions for completing the survey. The letter and survey were sent to the planning director/community development director with a copy to the city manager. A copy of the letter, the survey form and the mailing list are included at the end of this appendix.

The survey plan was to give respondents approximately one week to provide responses. It was hoped that this short turnaround time would ensure that the survey would receive prompt attention. After two weeks, cities that had not responded were contacted by telephone and offered the opportunity to provide responses in an interview with general plans and zoning ordinances to be sent in a follow up mailing. In addition, cities that responded by mail or fax would receive follow up telephone calls if they identified specific examples of development projects or programs that illustrated livable communities elements.

## SURVEY RESULTS

### Question 1: Name, City and Phone Number

Completed surveys were received from 13 of the South Bay Cities. The cities of Hawthorne and Rolling Hills Estates did not respond. Planning documents (General Plans, specific plans, zoning ordinances, and/or design guidelines) were received from the following nine cities: El Segundo, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Hermosa Beach, Lawndale, Torrance and Redondo Beach.

### Question 2: What areas within your city are most likely to experience new development or re-development during the next ten years?

All cities identified some potential for redevelopment, mostly in commercial areas. The specific locations identified by the cities as most likely to experience redevelopment in the near future are shown in Table A-1.

Only a few of the cities indicated a potential for significant new residential development. Lawndale anticipates redevelopment of all its residential neighborhoods. Torrance expects continued new multi-family development on scattered sites throughout the city. The City of Rancho Palos Verdes indicates potential for residential development around the Civic Center and the city's Portuguese Bend area. The City of Palos Verdes Estates indicates sporadic infill residential redevelopment will occur in connection with demolition of existing residences, as does Rolling Hills.

Table A-1: Areas Likely to Experience Redevelopment

City	Likely Redevelopment Areas
Carson	Carson Street from Figueroa to Avalon Main Street north of Carson Main and Sepulveda area, Main and Lomita area Alameda Street
El Segundo	Vacant land b/t railroads Various parcels, mostly south of I-105, east of Sepulveda
Gardena	Redondo Beach Blvd (Vermont to Crenshaw) Artesia Blvd (Vermont to Western) Western Ave (Marine to Artesia) Rosecrans (Normandie to Van Ness)
Hermosa Beach	Commercial zones along PCH (Artesia to Herondo) Commercial zones along PCH (Longfellow to Artesia)
Inglewood	Prairie Ave b/t Century Blvd and I-105 Century Blvd b/t I-405 and Inglewood Ave Market Street (downtown)
Lawndale	Hawthorne Blvd, south of 405 Artesia, Redondo Beach Blvd, E side of Hawthorne Blvd N of 405 All residential neighborhoods
Lomita	PCH between east and west city limits
Manhattan Beach	Metlox site (corner of Valley Dr and Manhattan Beach Blvd) Some commercial lots along Sepulveda Blvd (Rosecrans to Artesia) Some commercial lots along Rosecrans Ave (Sepulveda to Aviation)
Palos Verdes Estates	Single family residential only
Rancho Palos Verdes	Civic center and Portuguese Bend areas (residential redev.) Western Ave commercial corridor (comm redev.)
Redondo Beach	Powerplant/Harbor (bounded by ocean, Anita St, Catalina and Ber
Rolling Hills	Single family residential only
Torrance	Scattered multi-family infill sites Underutilized arterial sites, developed to mixed use Scattered light industrial and business park sites

**Question 3: Are there any recently-completed or planned developments within your city that you believe are good examples of mixed-use development, high-density development, transit-oriented development, or pedestrian-oriented development?**

Several cities identified recent or planned projects that demonstrate mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented or transit-oriented development. The City of Redondo Beach has approved plans for a mixed use project at 215 Avenue I, The Riviera Village. The project calls for 10,000 square feet of commercial space and 12 residential units in a small mixed-use village setting. Carson reported a mixed use project at the corner of Grace and Carson streets with 148 affordable housing units and street-fronting commercial. The planned infill commercial complex on the Metlox site in Manhattan Beach is expected to include retail, restaurants, professional offices, a small lodging component, and a public plaza. The project will interface with the city's civic center complex. The Morgan Stanley site in El Segundo, on North Nash Street, will include 2 hotels, 2 office buildings, and a professional sports facility. Torrance has several mixed-use, infill projects in its old downtown. The El Prado Apartments includes ground floor retail and apartment units that were recently rehabilitated. The Historic Downtown Mixed-Use Project includes affordable and market-rate apartments and eating places. The Brisas Del Mar project is a 44-unit townhouse that features pedestrian-friendly design in keeping with the old downtown character.

**Question 4: Have there been any recent denials of projects that feature mixed land uses, higher densities, transit-oriented development or pedestrian-oriented development?**

Most cities did not report any recent denials of a proposed development featuring mixed use, higher density, transit-oriented or pedestrian-oriented development. In Carson, the Greystone homes on Avalon was rejected by the planning commission because of its small lot layout.

**Question 5: Does your city have a design review process for any types of new development?**

Most of the South Bay Cities do not have a formal design review process apart from the traditional planning commission review during the permitting process. In Lawndale, residential developments of three or more units must undergo design review, as must commercial development in the Hawthorne Boulevard corridor. In Palos Verdes Estates, proposed development is reviewed by an Art Jury, as is development in the Miraleste area of Rancho Palos Verdes. Carson has a design overlay review in certain zones and in redevelopment areas. Torrance is in the process

of creating design guidelines and/or standards that will make the design review process more formalized.

**Question 6: Does your city allow mixed land uses within any zones in the city?**

A number of cities allow mixed-use development, though few have created specific mixed-use zones in an attempt to promote it. Redondo Beach has several mixed-use zoning categories, mostly along the PCH. All allow stand-alone commercial under 30,000 sq. ft., or residential units over commercial. Manhattan Beach allows mixed-use in three commercial zones with a use permit. Inglewood's C-1 zone (downtown) allows mixed-use. Carson has a mixed-use overlay zone on Carson Street (between Avalon and Main) that allows residential use in the commercial area. The General Plan for the City of Lomita allows mixed use in the downtown commercial zone, but the zoning ordinance does not yet reflect this. In El Segundo, the C-RS zone downtown allows very limited residential space over commercial. The city also has designated a two Mixed-Use zones that allow retail, office, hotel and R&D, but no residential. Torrance allows mixed use in its three commercial zones. Like many of the cities, however, Torrance does not yet have specific criteria for the review of mixed-use projects so all are evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

**Question 7: Does your city have any special overlay zones?**

Most of the cities use overlay zones in some manner, though generally not for encouraging livable communities features. The City of Redondo Beach has the Riviera Overlay Zone (which may be the best example of how this tool could be used in conjunction with livable communities elements) and a Historic Overlay Zone. Carson has the mixed-use overlay zone described above. In Manhattan Beach, the North-End Commercial zone requires special design standards to accommodate increased residential development in the commercial zone. Torrance has established several overlay zones for transitional areas around the Hawthorne Boulevard corridor.

**Question 8: Does your city zone for higher densities along transit routes?**

Only four of the cities could identify higher density zoning along transit routes. Lawndale has high density residential along several bus routes in the city. El Segundo allows higher density residential development along Imperial Avenue, Grand Avenue, and the northern portions of Main Street and Sepulveda Boulevard. Higher density commercial is allowed near the Green Line light rail stations. Carson allows high density residential on 223<sup>rd</sup> Avenue from Figueroa to Avalon and on Avalon north of Sepulveda. Torrance allows higher density housing and commercial development along several transit corridors in the city. The Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan, in

particular, allows high density multi-family and commercial development in the Del Amo Business District.

**Question 9: Has your city adopted, or is it considering, any developer incentive programs (e.g., reduced parking requirements, waiver of fees, density bonuses, expedited permitting) in pursuit of specific community planning goals?**

Several of the cities reduce parking requirements for specific projects or specific areas, including Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach and Inglewood. Torrance is considering reducing parking requirements near transit stops. Inglewood may provide a density bonus for site amenities or affordable housing units. In Lawndale, the Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan describes a Development Incentive program that may be granted at the discretion of the City Council or Redevelopment Agency. The program may allow a 20% increase in FAR and a 10% reduction in parking requirements for consolidation of small, contiguous parcels under one ownership, pedestrian amenities such as public plazas or pedestrian linkages, or projects that provide “exceptional benefits” to the city or “exceptional design.”

**Question 10: What do you think are the greatest impediments in your community to achieving development features such as mixed land uses, higher densities, transit-oriented development, and pedestrian-oriented development?**

Nearly all of the respondents provided comments on what were significant impediments to livable communities elements. The most frequently cited impediment was community resistance. In many cases the planners perceive residents as being content with the character of their communities and fearful of problems that could be brought about by change. In particular, mixed use projects bring fears of conflicts between residents and businesses. In one city, a bad past experience with a dense condo project has made residents wary of new infill housing. Traffic and security concerns were also mentioned.

Aside from community resistance, it was noted in several cases that the limited development potential and site configurations in built-out areas make incorporation of livable communities features extremely difficult. There is skepticism as to how much benefit can be gained from incorporating livable communities concepts in new development within auto-dominated cities. One respondent identified the main impediment to mixed-use development to be the fact that even small projects are discretionary and require a use permit. This respondent also identified very restrictive parking and open space requirements as barriers. Another cited difficulty of obtaining



financing for projects that are perceived as having high market risk due to their unique character. Related to this last point, it was noted that under current law, developers of condo buildings may be sued by any unit owner for construction problems for up to ten years after the completion of the project. This presents a disincentive for developers to build integrated units – detaching condo units can reduce developer liability.

June 11, 1999

Dear *Name* :

As you may know, the cities of the South Bay have been working in collaboration for several years in a Livable Communities program. The Livable Communities Working Group of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) was recently successful in obtaining funds from SCAG to hire a consultant team to develop land use strategies, design guidelines, and implementation strategies that address livable communities objectives. This letter requests information from your city that will be necessary to make this a truly useful project for all of the South Bay Cities. Specifically, we are requesting that you provide certain planning documents (e.g., general plan and zoning ordinance) and that you respond to the attached survey. The remainder of this letter will provide you with more background on the Livable Communities Project and the specific objectives of the consultant study.

The objectives of the SBCCOG Livable Communities program are to promote livable solutions to revitalize older downtown areas, retrofit auto-oriented areas to become more transit and pedestrian friendly, and design more appropriate in-fill development. By encouraging development that is consistent with these general objectives, we hope to improve the quality of development and the quality of life in our cities without contributing to already burdensome traffic problems.

The funding obtained from SCAG will be used to begin to move our collaborative program from a purely educational mode to implementation. The objectives of the SCAG-funded project are to develop a set of land use strategies and design guidelines appropriate to the development patterns of the South Bay Cities that result in trip reductions and to design model implementation strategies to help cities pursue more sustainable land use and urban design.

The consultant team that will be working with the Livable Communities Working Group is headed by Jack Faucett Associates and assisted by Siegel Diamond Architecture and Zinner Consultants. At the kickoff meeting for this contract, the consultant team identified a number of planning documents that would be useful background for the project. In addition, we agreed that it would be useful to conduct a brief survey of current development issues and projects that are relevant to livable communities goals. A copy of the survey is attached.

In addition to completing the survey, please provide the following documents to the consultant team:

- Copy of your city's general plan (land use, circulation, conservation, housing elements in particular)
- Copy of your city's zoning ordinance
- Copy of any specific plans developed for areas within your city
- Copy of any development standards not included in your general plan.

If any of the information requested in the survey is contained in the documents you are sending, you may so indicate in your survey response in order to save your time. Please send documents and survey responses by June 21 to:

Jack Faucett Associates  
Attn: Jeffrey Ang-Olson  
2855 Mitchell Drive, Suite 203  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

If you have any questions regarding the survey or the project you may contact any of the following people for further information:

1. Michael Fischer  
Project Manager  
Jack Faucett Associates  
(925) 943-2177
2. Leslie Scott  
Assistant Coordinator  
South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
(634) 304-0768
3. Pamela Parkin Tate  
Planning Manager  
City of Torrance  
(310) 618-5990

Thank you for your support on this important project for the South Bay Cities.

Sincerely,  
Pamela Parkin Tate, Chair  
South Bay Cities COG  
Livable Communities Working Group

cc: City Managers

1. Your name: City: Phone:
2. What areas within your city are most likely to experience new development or re-development during the next ten years? Please indicate the location by naming the district or providing the streets that form boundaries of the area. Also identify the predominant land uses in the area.
3. Are there any recently-completed or planned developments within your city that you believe are good examples of mixed-use development, high-density development, transit-oriented development, or pedestrian-oriented development? Please describe the location and predominant land uses of these developments.
4. Have there been any recent denials of projects that feature mixed land uses, higher densities, transit-oriented development or pedestrian-oriented development? If so, please describe the reasons why the project was unsuccessful.
5. Does your city have a design review process for any types of new development? Please provide a description of these processes.

6. Does your city allow mixed land uses within any zones in the city? Please identify the locations of these zones.
7. Does your city have any special overlay zones? Please describe and identify the locations of these zones.
8. Does your city zone for higher densities along transit routes? Please identify the locations of these routes.
9. Has your city adopted, or is it considering, any developer incentive programs (e.g., reduced parking requirements, waiver of fees, density bonuses, expedited permitting) in pursuit of specific community planning goals? If so, please describe the programs.
10. What do you think are the greatest impediments in your community to achieving development features such as mixed land uses, higher densities, transit-oriented development, and pedestrian-oriented development?

*Thank you!*

# APPENDIX A

## South Bay Cities Survey – Mailing List

Job Title	First Name	Last Name	City
City Manager	Jerome	Groomes	Carson
Planning Director	Patrick	Brown	Carson
Community Planning Manager	Sheri	Repp	Carson
City Manager	Mary	Strenn	El Segundo
Planning Director	Bret	Bernard	El Segundo
City Manager	Mitchell	Lansdell	Gardena
Planning Director	Jack	Messerlian	Gardena
City Manager	Bud	Cormier	Hawthorne
Planning Director	Mike	Goodson	Hawthorne
City Manager	Stephen	Burrell	Hermosa Beach
Planning Director	Mike	Schubach	Hermosa Beach
Administrative Officer	Joe	Rouzan	Inglewood
Planning Director	Lori	Parcells	Inglewood
City Manager	Vangie	Schock	Lawndale
Planning Director	Bob	Goldin	Lawndale
City Administrator	Mike	O'Connor	Lomita
Planning Director	Richard	Kawasaki	Lomita
City Manager	Geoff	Dolan	Manhattan Beach
Director of Community Development	Richard	Thompson	Manhattan Beach
Senior Planner	Rosemary	Lackow	Manhattan Beach
City Manager	James	Hendrickson	Palos Verdes Estates
Planning Director	Tim	D'Zmura	Palos Verdes Estates
City Manager	Les	Evans	Rancho Palos Verdes
Planning Director	Joel	Rojas	Rancho Palos Verdes
City Manager	Paul	Connolly	Redondo Beach
Chief of Planning	William	Meeker	Redondo Beach
Senior Planner	Anita	Kroeger	Redondo Beach
City Manager	Craig	Nealis	Rolling Hills
Planning Director	Lola	Ungar	Rolling Hills
City Manager	Douglas	Prichard	Rolling Hills Estates
Planning Director	Oscar	Orci	Rolling Hills Estates
Planning Director	Jeff	Gibson	Torrance
City Manager	Leroy	Jackson	Torrance
Planning Manager	Pamela	Tate	Torrance